

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of the Claims**

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 54-56 and indicating that claim 50 is allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 50 has been rewritten in independent form and now incorporates all limitations of the base claims. Claim 55 is amended to merely clarify the antecedent basis. Claims 1-49 and 51-53 have been canceled without disclaimer or prejudice against the prosecution of the claims in future applications. New claims 57-72 are added. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification as originally filed, for example, in paragraphs [160], [162], [164], and [181], and claims 1, 8, 9, and 10 as originally filed. Thus, the amendment does not introduce new matter.

### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Enablement**

The Office maintained rejections of claims 1-3, 8-10, and 51-53 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. While acknowledging that the specification is enabling for (1) a method of inhibiting proliferation of a tumor cell comprising the step of inhibiting FoxM1B activity in the tumor cell by contacting the cell with a p19ARF protein fragment *in vitro*, and (2) a method of inhibiting proliferation of a liver tumor cell comprising the step of inhibiting FoxM1B activity in the liver tumor cell by contacting the cell with a p19ARF protein fragment *in vivo*, the Office asserted that the specification does not enable a skilled in the art to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections but have nevertheless amended the claims. The claims, as amended, are directed to (1) a method of inhibiting proliferation of a tumor cell comprising the step of inhibiting FoxM1B activity in the tumor cell by contacting the cell with a p19ARF protein fragment *in vitro*, and (2) a method of inhibiting proliferation of a liver tumor cell comprising the step of inhibiting FoxM1B activity in the liver tumor cell by contacting the cell with a p19ARF protein fragment *in vitro* and *in vivo*, the subject matter that is clearly enabled by the specification as

acknowledged by the Office. Thus, Applicants submit that current amendment has rendered the rejections moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for lacking enablement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

### **III. Conclusions**

Applicants respectfully submit that all conditions of patentability are satisfied in the pending claim. Allowance of the claim is thereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner in charge of this application is invited to contact the undersigned representative as indicated below if it is believed to be helpful.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 23, 2008

By: /Y. Elaine Chang/  
Yijan Elaine Chang  
Reg. No. 54,698

**McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP**

300 South Wacker Drive, Ste 3100

Chicago, IL 60606

Telephone: (312) 913-0001

Facsimile: (312) 913-0002